



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/637,508	08/11/2000	Markku Vehvilainen	915-374	7877

4955 7590 11/10/2003

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &  
ADOLPHSON, LLP  
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5  
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

LEE, Y YOUNG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/637,508

Applicant(s)  
Markku Vehvilainen

Examiner  
Y. Lee

Art Unit  
2613



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6-8 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2613

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yasue et al (EP 0 944 261 A2).

Art Unit: 2613

Yasue et al, in Figures 1-3 and 8-13, discloses a video signal processing apparatus that is the same method and arrangement for reducing the volume or rate of an encoded digital video bitstream that fulfils a certain set of predefined structural rules as specified in claims 1-21 of the present invention, characterized in that it comprises means for partly decoding 1002 the encoded digital video bitstream, means of reducing 903 the amount of bits in the partly decoded digital video bitstream; means for re-encoding 1009 the partly decoded digital video bitstream in which the amount of bits is reduced; a bitstream analyzer 902 arranged to separate a number of variable length encoded, weighted and quantized DCT coefficient matrices from an MPEG-2-encoded digital video bitstream, a variable length decoder 1002 for decoding the variable length coding of the variable length encoded, weighted and quantized DCT coefficient matrices; a low pass filter 1005 with multitude of different filtering functions upon different coefficient groups within a single DCT coefficient matrix, wherein each filtering function is dependent on the contents of the DCT coefficient matrix which is filtered to represent the weighted and quantized DCT coefficient matrices; and a requantization block (1003, 1007, 1008) arranged to divide a DCT coefficient matrix by a certain second variable value.

4. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al (EP 0 687 112 A2).

Takahashi et al, in Figures 2-7, 10-13, and 15-17, discloses an image conversion apparatus that is the same method and arrangement for reducing the volume or rate of an encoded digital video bitstream that fulfils a certain set of predefined structural rules as specified in

Art Unit: 2613

claims 1 and 13 of the present invention, characterized in that it comprises means for partly decoding 201 the encoded digital video bitstream, means of reducing 202 the amount of bits in the partly decoded digital video bitstream; and means for re-encoding 203 the partly decoded digital video bitstream in which the amount of bits is reduced.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-12 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al in view of Yamakage et al (5,872,597).

Although Takahashi et al discloses a variable length decoder 201 for decoding the variable length coding of the variable length encoded, weighted and quantized DCT coefficient matrices 180; a low pass filter (202, 301) with multitude of different filtering functions upon different coefficient groups within a single DCT coefficient matrix, wherein each filtering function (202, 301) is dependent on the contents of the DCT coefficient matrix which is filtered to represent the weighted and quantized DCT coefficient matrices; and a requantization block 140 arranged to divide a DCT coefficient matrix by a certain second variable value, it is noted

Art Unit: 2613

Takahashi et al differs from the present invention in that it fails to disclose any details of a bitstream analyzer. Yamakage et al however, in Figures 5-10, teaches the concept of such well known bitstream analyzer 30 arranged to separate a number of variable length encoded, weighted and quantized DCT coefficient matrices from an MPEG-2-encoded digital video bitstream.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, having both the references of Takahashi et al and Yamakage et al before him/her, to incorporate the common bitstream analyzer as taught in Yamakage et al before the decoding arrangement of Takahashi et al in order to miniaturize the circuit scale, thereby providing the moving picture signal decoding system capable of operating in higher speed.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Adolph et al discloses a method and device for the transcoding of bit streams with video data.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Art Unit: 2613

(for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

**Or:**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Y. Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-7584.

  
**Y. LEE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Y. Lee/yl  
October 23, 2003